

ATTACHMENT A

THE VERIZON TELEPHONE COMPANIES

The Verizon telephone companies are the local exchange carriers affiliated with Verizon Communications Inc. These are:

Contel of the South, Inc. d/b/a Verizon Mid-States
GTE Southwest Incorporated d/b/a Verizon Southwest
The Micronesian Telecommunications Corporation
Verizon California Inc.
Verizon Delaware Inc.
Verizon Florida Inc.
Verizon Hawaii Inc.
Verizon Maryland Inc.
Verizon New England Inc.
Verizon New Jersey Inc.
Verizon New York Inc.
Verizon North Inc.
Verizon Northwest Inc.
Verizon Pennsylvania Inc.
Verizon South Inc.
Verizon Virginia Inc.
Verizon Washington, DC Inc.
Verizon West Virginia Inc.

ATTACHMENT B

Ordering and Billing Forum Issue Identification Form

OBF Issue Number	2308
Date Submitted	08/10/01
Date Accepted	08/27/01 at OBF # 75
Initial Closure	10/14/04 at OBF # 88
Final Closure	12/08/04 at OBF #
Issue Category	RESOLVED

Document Name: _____

Industry Segment: _____

Part A, Page 1

Issue Title: Need for Accurate Jurisdictional Information for Accurate Billing

Issue Statement/Business Need: In the evolving telecommunications industry, it is becoming difficult to determine the correct jurisdiction for billing and some taxing processes.

One example: A wireless customer based in North Carolina, goes on vacation to Orlando. In Orlando, the wireless customer goes off hook placing a call back home to North Carolina which is a different MTA, the wireless call goes to the Orlando MTSO and the call is carried by a network to North Carolina and is terminated to the local exchange company wireline network. To the local exchange company in North Carolina, the originating number is the North Carolina cellular number and the call appears to be local. Since the call appears to be a local call, the interconnection billing is billed as local causing incorrect billing and potentially incorrect taxing.

Due to the evolving telecommunications industry, there is a need for something to give us the ability to identify and bill the correct jurisdiction. There needs to be a method to identify the office where the call originated. This jurisdictional information needs to identify the switch and should be carried through the network to the terminating office and captured in a terminating recording.

Impact on Other Issues or Procedures:

Desired Results: To provide a way to identify the correct jurisdiction to be used in billing and taxing of a call. The most preferable solution is that information in the recording can be used to determine the real jurisdiction of the call.

Committee Assignment: Billing Committee

Associated Committee:

(2308.doc)

Ordering and Billing Forum Issue Identification Form

OBF Issue Number	2308
Date Submitted	08/10/01
Date Accepted	08/27/01 at OBF # 75
Initial Closure	10/14/04 at OBF # 88
Final Closure	12/08/04 at OBF #
Issue Category	RESOLVED

Document Name: _____

Industry Segment: _____

Part A, Page 2

Issue Title: Need for Accurate Jurisdictional Information for Accurate Billing

Company Name:	BellSouth Billing Inc.	Company Name:	
Address:	600 North 19 th Street 28 th Floor	Address:	
Telephone Number:	205-321-4016	Telephone Number:	
Email:	Randall.Reeves@BellSouth.com	Email:	

Resolution:

The Billing Committee has reached consensus to use the 7 Rules for Populating JIP approved by NIIF in NIOC Issue 0208 to identify the originating switch or MSC. The Billing Committee supports those rules recognizing that the JIP at a state/LATA level will not provide sufficient detail to determine local jurisdiction.

The Billing Committee's preferred solution would have been to use the JIP at a cell site level. Based on industry limitations, this was an unworkable solution.

7 Rules for Populating JIP

1. JIP should be populated in the Initial Address Messages (IAMs) of all wireline and wireless originating calls where technically feasible.
2. JIP should be populated with an NPA-NXX that is assigned in the LERG to the originating switch or MSC.

Ordering and Billing Forum Issue Identification Form

OBF Issue Number	2308	
Date Submitted	08/10/01	
Date Accepted	08/27/01	at OBF # 75
Initial Closure	10/14/04	at OBF # 88
Final Closure	12/08/04	at OBF #
Issue Category	RESOLVED	

Part B, Page 1
(Status History)

Issue Title: Need for Accurate Jurisdictional Information for Accurate Billing

3. The NIIF does not recommend proposing that the JIP parameter be mandatory since calls missing any mandatory parameter will be aborted. However the NIIF strongly recommends that the JIP be populated on all calls where technologically possible.

4. Where technically feasible if the originating switch or MSC serves multiple states/LATAs, then the switch should support multiple JIPs such that the JIP used for a given call can be populated with an NPA-NXX that is specific to both the switch as well as the state and LATA of the caller.

If the JIP cannot be populated at the state and LATA level, the JIP should be populated with an NPA-NXX specific to the originating switch or MSC where it is technically feasible.

5. Where the originating switch cannot signal JIP it is desirable that the subsequent switch in the call path populate the JIP using a data fill default associated with the incoming route. The value of the data fill item is an NPA-NXX associated with the originating switch or MSC and reflects its location.

6. When call forwarding occurs, the forwarded from DN (Directory Number) field will be populated, the JIP will be changed to a JIP associated with the forwarded from DN and the new called DN will be inserted in the IAM.

7. As per T1.TRQ2, the JIP should be reset when a new billable call leg is created.

Ordering and Billing Forum Issue Identification Form

OBF Issue Number	2308
Date Submitted	08/10/01
Date Accepted	08/27/01 at OBF # 75
Initial Closure	10/14/04 at OBF # 88
Final Closure	12/08/04 at OBF #
Issue Category	RESOLVED

**Part B, Page 2
(Status History)**

Issue Title: Need for Accurate Jurisdictional Information for Accurate Billing

OBF #75, AUGUST 27-29, 2001

Mr. Randall Reeves (BellSouth) presented this Issue regarding a need for accurate jurisdictional information for accurate billing.

Mr. Reeves stated that in the evolving telecommunications industry, it is becoming difficult to determine the correct jurisdiction for billing and some taxing processes.

One example: A wireless customer based in North Carolina goes on vacation to Orlando. In Orlando, the wireless customer goes off hook placing a call back home to North Carolina which is a different MTA, the wireless call goes to the Orlando MTSO and the call is carried by a network to North Carolina and is terminated to the local exchange company wireline network. To the local Exchange Company in North Carolina, the originating number is the North Carolina cellular number and the call appears to be local. Since the call appears to be a local call, the interconnection billing is billed as local causing incorrect billing and potentially incorrect taxing.

Due to the evolving telecommunications industry, there is a need for something to give us the ability to identify and bill the correct jurisdiction. There needs to be a method to identify the office where the call originated. This jurisdictional information needs to identify the switch and should be carried through the network to the terminating office and captured in a terminating recording.

Ms. Tami Spocogee (McLeod) asked if this would be a situation where the billing company would use PIU. Mr. Reeves explained that under normal circumstances they would, but the information is not being received correctly. He further explained that his company desires to use actuals vs. factors.

Ms. Jill Blakeley indicated that a solution exists, but is dependent on the switch.
(2308.doc)

Ordering and Billing Forum Issue Identification Form

OBF Issue Number	2308
Date Submitted	08/10/01
Date Accepted	08/27/01 at OBF # 75
Initial Closure	10/14/04 at OBF # 88
Final Closure	12/08/04 at OBF #
Issue Category	RESOLVED

**Part B, Page 3
(Status History)**

Issue Title: Need for Accurate Jurisdictional Information for Accurate Billing

OBF #75, AUGUST 27-29, 2001 (CONTINUED)

Mr. Reeves further stated that the desired result would be to provide a way to identify the correct jurisdiction to be used in billing and taxing of a call. The most preferable solution is that information in the recording can be used to determine the real jurisdiction of the call.

After review of the revised Issue Statement and Desired Results with the Committee, the Committee reviewed the new Issue acceptance criteria and accepted the Issue.

This Issue will remain in OPEN status and worked within the Billing Committee.

Mr. Reeves reviewed the Issue and Desired Results. He explained that he thought the next step would be to draft a letter to the T1 Committee explaining this situation and the industry need. Mr. Reeves asked if everyone understood the Issue. A participant expressed that she did not understand the Issue being presented. Mr. Reeves drew a picture depicting the example explained in the Issue, and walked through the diagram.

Ms. Lois Fries stated that there appear to be similarities between this issue and her new Issue 2. She questioned if the situation explained, using the originating and terminating number to determine jurisdiction, is in compliance with correct process. Ms. Fries felt that this would be in conflict with a prior Resolution to Issue 1918. Mr. Reeves explained that people who monitor traffic in his company have seen a large amount of the traffic shown in the example coming through as local traffic. This then gets billed as local traffic, which is incorrect. There continued to be discussion regarding the assumptions necessary for using factors, along with the appropriate way to bill this usage. Mr. Reeves clarified that the desire is to use actuals vs. factors.

Ordering and Billing Forum Issue Identification Form

OBF Issue Number	2308
Date Submitted	08/10/01
Date Accepted	08/27/01 at OBF # 75
Initial Closure	10/14/04 at OBF # 88
Final Closure	12/08/04 at OBF #
Issue Category	RESOLVED

**Part B, Page 4
(Status History)**

Issue Title: Need for Accurate Jurisdictional Information for Accurate Billing

Ordering and Billing Forum Issue Identification Form

OBF Issue Number	2308
Date Submitted	08/10/01
Date Accepted	08/27/01 at OBF # 75
Initial Closure	10/14/04 at OBF # 88
Final Closure	12/08/04 at OBF #
Issue Category	RESOLVED

**Part B, Page 5
(Status History)**

Issue Title: Need for Accurate Jurisdictional Information for Accurate Billing

OBF #75, AUGUST 27-29, 2001 (CONTINUED)

Mr. Augie Lindsay (PaeTec) asked to add a CLEC to the example in order to address his company's situation. He stated his company depends on BellSouth to report the correct trunk group. Ms. Fries added some additional criteria with regard to intrastate/interstate to the example to further understand the situation being discussed. Mr. Larry Martin (Citizens Communications) explained how Citizens is in the same situation with contracts that they have with carriers.

Mr. Lindsay asked if companies have different OCNs for local vs. IXC traffic. Mr. Reeves explained that the situation is complicated by the use of the CIC rather than or in addition to OCN. Mr. Reeves further explained that the problem would be resolved if they could identify the originating end office.

Ms. Fries expressed that she felt this Issue was in direct contradiction to her Issue. Mr. Martin interpreted new Issue 2309 as a means to facilitate a solution to new Issue 2308. Ms. Fries was concerned that the Committee may need to readdress 1918. Mr. Reeves stated that 1918 would stand and would be the preferred way to handle traffic. Mr. Ken Babcock (Advanced Technologies) noted that there are still intrastate and interstate issues, and Mr. Reeves agreed this was still an Issue. Mr. Lindsay felt that most companies are faced with this Issue and there is a need for a Resolution. Mr. Leonard Boone (Focal Communications Corp.) explained the problem his company is currently experiencing and felt that a Resolution would solve his problems. He further explained calls disputed by his company.

Mr. Mike Browning (Verizon) explained his situation goes one step further and drops the call as an intraoffice call.

Ordering and Billing Forum Issue Identification Form

OBF Issue Number	2308
Date Submitted	08/10/01
Date Accepted	08/27/01 at OBF # 75
Initial Closure	10/14/04 at OBF # 88
Final Closure	12/08/04 at OBF #
Issue Category	RESOLVED

Part B, Page 6
(Status History)

Issue Title: Need for Accurate Jurisdictional Information for Accurate Billing

OBF #75, AUGUST 27-29, 2001 (CONTINUED)

Ms. Sue Kriebel (Qwest) clarified that Mr. Reeves is asking that the Committee ask T1 if there is anything in the network or switch that would help the industry with this determination. Mr. Reeves stated that BellSouth would like something captured in the signaling path that can be passed through the network and captured in the recording to identify the correct jurisdiction. Mr. Reeves explained that he wanted to see if other companies were having this problem or if they had found a way to solve it. Through these discussions it seems that this is a problem in the industry, and that there is not currently a solution. He recognized that one option would be to say that calls would never be billed as local traffic if they come on an IXC trunk, but would be billed as Interstate or Intrastate. Mr. Reeves stated that his intent is not to change the Resolution of Issue 1918. Mr. Browning asked about the regulatory policy on this. Ms. Kriebel said there are no regulatory guidelines, but that these situations are addressed in the contracts.

Mr. Reeves explained the example based on criteria that Mr. Lindsay placed on the example. Mr. Reeves further explained that cellular MTAs could span over several states. There was further discussion about varied criteria for the given example. There was discussion around the difference in cellular local and long distance. A participant stated the cellular MTA is local, otherwise it is considered Inter/Intrastate. Another participant expressed that this is not limited to cellular, but also to CLECs. Mr. Reeves suggested that in the CLEC situation, this traffic would be recognized by the TN. A participant clarified they do not get the TN if they are behind the ILEC.

Mr. Reeves asked if the Committee was in agreement. Ms. Fries again expressed that she felt the Committee needed to readdress Issue 1918, otherwise there will be more than one solution. It was further clarified that this is a problem with Supertrunks. Mr.

Ordering and Billing Forum Issue Identification Form

OBF Issue Number	2308
Date Submitted	08/10/01
Date Accepted	08/27/01 at OBF # 75
Initial Closure	10/14/04 at OBF # 88
Final Closure	12/08/04 at OBF #
Issue Category	RESOLVED

**Part B, Page 7
(Status History)**

Issue Title: Need for Accurate Jurisdictional Information for Accurate Billing

OBF #75, AUGUST 27-29, 2001 (CONTINUED)

Reeves stated that he felt the Committee should review 1918 and see how it relates to this Issue.

Ms. Thompson reviewed Issue 1918 and its final Resolution summary.

Ms. Nancy Webber (Sprint) stated that she felt Issue 1918 did not address Mr. Reeves concern. Ms. Fries and Ms. Webber conversed about Issue 1918 and its intent. The group continued to discuss the relationship between the new Issue and Issue 1918. In the end, several companies agreed that it was their desire to use actuals vs. factors.

Qwest, Sprint, PaeTec, AT&T, Verizon, WorldCom and ALLTEL would support sending a letter to the T1 Network group to request assistance with being able to bill these records correctly.

Mr. Martin stated that he thought Indicator 9, as currently in EMI, might work for this Issue. Mr. Reeves thought this Indicator was only recorded on the end user side, not access.

To summarize, Ms. Thompson thought there was consensus to send a letter requesting the T1 Committee evaluate a possible solution that would provide Billing Committee members the information needed in the recording. Mr. Babcock and Ms. Jami Larson (Qwest) volunteered to assist the Co-Leaders in writing a letter to T1.

Ms. Jill Fust (SBC) was concerned that T1 would request companies upgrade their switches and that would be a burden on some companies. Mr. Reeves explained that usually for T1 upgrades they are included in the next generic upgrade if it's a financially

Ordering and Billing Forum Issue Identification Form

OBF Issue Number	2308
Date Submitted	08/10/01
Date Accepted	08/27/01 at OBF # 75
Initial Closure	10/14/04 at OBF # 88
Final Closure	12/08/04 at OBF #
Issue Category	RESOLVED

**Part B, Page 8
(Status History)**

Issue Title: Need for Accurate Jurisdictional Information for Accurate Billing

OBF #75, AUGUST 27-29, 2001 (CONTINUED)

feasible upgrade. Ms. Fust recommended that the Committee assign some homework to talk with their T1 people and see if the request was feasible.

Mr. Walter Wilson (Intec Telecom Systems) requested clarification that the need was to take (the MTSO) information and pass it further down the line than is currently passed. Mr. Reeves concurred.

Ms. Fries questioned the use of a temporary number for a roaming wireless call. Mr. Martin clarified that this would be the WTN. Mr. Reeves concurred that there were 2 numbers, but it was not the temporary number. Mr. Wilson also thought that in some scenarios, you might not get the appropriate jurisdiction.

Ms. Thompson summarized that a small group will draft a letter to T1 and present the draft to the Committee this afternoon. Participants would take this letter to their network people for review and submit comments for OBF #76.

A draft letter was presented to the Committee for review. Minor revisions were made and a homework item was established. (The draft letter has been provided as Attachment 2308a1.)

Ordering and Billing Forum Issue Identification Form

OBF Issue Number	2308
Date Submitted	08/10/01
Date Accepted	08/27/01 at OBF # 75
Initial Closure	10/14/04 at OBF # 88
Final Closure	12/08/04 at OBF #
Issue Category	RESOLVED

Part B, Page 9
(Status History)

Issue Title: Need for Accurate Jurisdictional Information for Accurate Billing

OBF #75, AUGUST 27-29, 2001 (CONTINUED)

HOMEWORK ITEM

ESTABLISHED AT: OBF #75

ISSUE # 2308 DATE: 8/26/01

DUE DATE: OBF #76

RESPONSIBLE: BILLING COMMITTEE

1. Participants are to take the draft T1 letter to their company's T1 representative and/or Network People for review and submit comments for OBF #76.

This Issue will remain in OPEN status and worked within the Billing Committee.

Ordering and Billing Forum Issue Identification Form

OBF Issue Number	2308
Date Submitted	08/10/01
Date Accepted	08/27/01 at OBF # 75
Initial Closure	10/14/04 at OBF # 88
Final Closure	12/08/04 at OBF #
Issue Category	RESOLVED

**Part B, Page 10
(Status History)**

Issue Title: Need for Accurate Jurisdictional Information for Accurate Billing

OBF #76, NOVEMBER 5-7, 2001

Ms. Thompson, Billing Co-Leader, presented this Issue regarding a need for accurate jurisdictional information for accurate billing.

Ms. Thompson reviewed the letter, written to the T1 Committee that was previously drafted at OBF #75.

Ms. Fust (SBC) stated that after review of the letter and conversations with her T1 Representative, they felt as though a possible solution would be the Jurisdiction Information Parameter (JIP), which is not currently being used properly.

Ms. Blakeley (Time Warner) stated that Nortel and Lucent switches could record the JIP, but other vendor switches could not. It was further stated that companies would need to have SS7 capability to get the JIP. There was discussion regarding how the JIP recording is packaged amongst vendors.

There was discussion regarding the JIP as a solution and how it would be accomplished.

Mr. Reeves, Billing Co-Leader, confirmed that his T1 representatives also noted JIP as a possible solution.

Ms. Thompson called for questions.

Ms. Fries (Intermedia) asked if MTAs are defined by LATAs? A participant stated the FCC defined MTAs in the Telecom Act of 1996. Mr. Reeves explained the Issue in more detail, with special regard to IntraLATA/InterLATA and Interstate/Intrastate.

Ordering and Billing Forum Issue Identification Form

OBF Issue Number	2308	
Date Submitted	08/10/01	
Date Accepted	08/27/01	at OBF # 75
Initial Closure	10/14/04	at OBF # 88
Final Closure	12/08/04	at OBF #
Issue Category	RESOLVED	

Part B, Page 11
(Status History)

Issue Title: Need for Accurate Jurisdictional Information for Accurate Billing

OBF #76, NOVEMBER 5-7, 2001 (CONTINUED)

Ms. Webber (Sprint) pointed out that the correct rate could be higher or lower and Mr. Reeves pointed out that the correct taxing is also an Issue.

Ms. Blakeley (Time Warner) asked if the Committee was going to ask T1 to fix JIP. Mr. Reeves clarified that the Committee would not tell them to fix JIP, but rather that Billing is asking for a solution from T1. If the Billing Committee is not comfortable with the T1 recommended solution, then the Issue will remain in Open status and correspondence will continue.

Mr. Reeves asked for consensus to forward the drafted letter to the T1 Committee. Consensus was reached to forward the letter to T1.

The correspondence has been logged and posted to the OBF Correspondence Page as Reference Number (020206-001) and is also accessible via the following URL:

http://www.atis.org/ATIS/CLC/OBF/obf_corr.htm

This Issue will remain in OPEN status and be worked within the full Billing Committee.

Ordering and Billing Forum Issue Identification Form

OBF Issue Number	2308
Date Submitted	08/10/01
Date Accepted	08/27/01 at OBF # 75
Initial Closure	10/14/04 at OBF # 88
Final Closure	12/08/04 at OBF #
Issue Category	RESOLVED

**Part B, Page 12
(Status History)**

Issue Title: Need for Accurate Jurisdictional Information for Accurate Billing

OBF #77, FEBRUARY 11-13, 2002

Mr. Andy Plummer, BellSouth, presented this issue regarding a need for accurate jurisdictional information for accurate billing.

Mr. Plummer reminded the committee that a letter was forwarded to the T1 Committee following OBF #76.

Mr. Plummer advised the committee that the T1 Committee had responded to the Billing Committee's correspondence. (020206-001).

Mr. Plummer moved forward by reviewing the response letter.

After review of the T1 correspondence, Mr. Plummer suggested moving forward by drafting a response letter for further clarification to the T1 Committee.

Several participants volunteered to draft the response letter.

Mr. Plummer reviewed the drafted correspondence with the committee. After review, consensus was met to forward the letter to T1.

The correspondence has been logged and posted to the OBF Correspondence Page as Reference Number (020304-001) and (020304-002) and are also accessible via the following URL:

This issue will remain in OPEN status and be worked within the full Billing Committee.

Ordering and Billing Forum Issue Identification Form

OBF Issue Number	2308
Date Submitted	08/10/01
Date Accepted	08/27/01 at OBF # 75
Initial Closure	10/14/04 at OBF # 88
Final Closure	12/08/04 at OBF #
Issue Category	RESOLVED

**Part B, Page 13
(Status History)**

Issue Title: Need for Accurate Jurisdictional Information for Accurate Billing

OBF #78, MAY 6-7, 2002

Mr. Andy Plummer, BellSouth, presented this issue regarding a need for accurate jurisdictional information for accurate billing.

Mr. Plummer reminded the committee that a letter was forwarded for further clarification to the T1P1 (020304-001) and TR45.2 (020304-002) Committees.

There has been no response from either committee at this time. Therefore, this issue will be deferred until OBF #79.

This issue will remain in OPEN status and be worked within the full Billing Committee.

Ordering and Billing Forum Issue Identification Form

OBF Issue Number	2308
Date Submitted	08/10/01
Date Accepted	08/27/01 at OBF # 75
Initial Closure	10/14/04 at OBF # 88
Final Closure	12/08/04 at OBF #
Issue Category	RESOLVED

**Part B, Page 14
(Status History)**

Issue Title: Need for Accurate Jurisdictional Information for Accurate Billing

OBF #79, AUGUST 19-23, 2002

Mr. Randall Reeves, BellSouth, presented this issue regarding a need for accurate jurisdictional information for accurate billing.

Mr. Reeves reminded the committee that a letter was forwarded for further clarification to the T1P1 and TR45.2 Committees (020304-002 / 020304-001) and there had been no response from either committee at the time. However, with Mr. Stuart Goldman, T1S1.3 Chair, being present, Mr. Reeves requested Mr. Goldman's assistance with this issue.

Mr. Reeves questioned whether or not JIP could be a potential solution.

Mr. Reeves stated that JIP might be recorded on the originating side. However, on the terminating side some companies have had difficulties receiving the JIP.

Mr. Goldman stated that JIP should be populated at the originating office and signaled through the network. Therefore, the JIP should be able to be populated on the terminating side.

A question was raised as to whether JIP would be passed through the SS7 protocol. Mr. Goldman responded, yes.

Since the JIP is being signaled, participants asked how this would be populated in the AMA recording.

Qwest did not feel that JIP was the correct solution because they felt as though the documentation around the population of JIP was not as strong as it should be.

Ordering and Billing Forum Issue Identification Form

OBF Issue Number	2308
Date Submitted	08/10/01
Date Accepted	08/27/01 at OBF # 75
Initial Closure	10/14/04 at OBF # 88
Final Closure	12/08/04 at OBF #
Issue Category	RESOLVED

Part B, Page 15
(Status History)

Issue Title: Need for Accurate Jurisdictional Information for Accurate Billing

OBF #79, AUGUST 19-23, 2002 (CONTINUED)

Mr. Goldman indicated that the LNP Specifications state that the JIP should be populated to communicate the geographic location.

It was further defined that multiple JIPs could be signaled (the originating, transiting and terminating).

It was identified that the JIP is part of the modular 720-Structure Code and furthermore, you could have more than two 720 modules.

Ms. DiAnne Nichol (Alltel) stated that in a traffic study they have only seen 10 percent of the usage traffic with JIP signaled. Ms. Nichol requested help in getting a higher percentage of population and emphasized again that if JIP is not signaled, it will not resolve this issue.

It was stated that if JIP were to be the solution, the committee would need help in increasing the population of JIP.

The following homework items were created in order to move forward with this issue:

Ordering and Billing Forum Issue Identification Form

OBF Issue Number	2308
Date Submitted	08/10/01
Date Accepted	08/27/01 at OBF # 75
Initial Closure	10/14/04 at OBF # 88
Final Closure	12/08/04 at OBF #
Issue Category	RESOLVED

Part B, Page 16
(Status History)

Issue Title: Need for Accurate Jurisdictional Information for Accurate Billing

OBF #79, AUGUST 19-21, 2002 (CONTINUED)

HOMEWORK ITEM

ESTABLISHED AT: OBF #79

ISSUE # 2308 DATE: 08/20/02

DUE DATE: OBF #80

RESPONSIBLE: BILLING COMMITTEE

1. Work with wireless workshop to help them understand the need of signaling the JIP for correct billing to occur. (Ms. Webber & Ms. Thompson)
2. Work with Telcordia AMA Technical Review Group in order to determine what could be done to assist with the population of the JIP in the AMA recordings. (Ms. Elshamy & Ken Babcock)
3. Follow up on lack of response to previous letter sent/escalate the response through ATIS leadership. (Ms. Webber & Ms. Thompson)

This issue will remain in OPEN status and be worked within the full Billing Committee.

Ordering and Billing Forum Issue Identification Form

OBF Issue Number	2308
Date Submitted	08/10/01
Date Accepted	08/27/01 at OBF # 75
Initial Closure	10/14/04 at OBF # 88
Final Closure	12/08/04 at OBF #
Issue Category	RESOLVED

Part B, Page 17
(Status History)

Issue Title: Need for Accurate Jurisdictional Information for Accurate Billing

OBF #80, NOVEMBER 18-20, 2002

Mr. Bill Krall (Telcordia) reviewed a presentation for clarification purposes in regard to this issue. (The presentation has been provided as Attachment 2308a2.)

Based on information provided by Mr. Krall, the committee agreed to send a letter to Co-Chair, Bob Hall at T1S1 and Co-Chair, Dana Smith, at the Industry Numbering Committee (INC) explaining the issue problem and asking for a solution.

The letter will summarize the following:

- Business problem -
The Jurisdiction Information Parameter (JIP) does not provide the jurisdiction of the call.
- Clarify Guidelines for JIP population
- Clarify INC Guidelines on Local Routing Number (LRN) assignment to assign LRNs at a level that provides all of the jurisdictional information we need.
- Information Needed:
- Ability to use the first six digits of LRN to derive State and LATA uniqueness.
- Spoke with co-chair, Stuart Goldman, T1S1.3

Ms. DiAnne Nichol (Alltel) will send a draft letter to Larry Martin (TXU Communications), Chris Sullivan (Verizon), Nancy Webber (Sprint) and Mer Thompson (AT&T) for review. A conference call was scheduled in order to discuss the draft letter on December 9, 2002 at 2:00 p.m. – 3:00 p.m. Eastern Time. Ms. Webber will provide the conference call information. No administration is required for the call.

This issue will remain in OPEN status and be worked within the full Billing Committee.

Ordering and Billing Forum Issue Identification Form

OBF Issue Number	2308
Date Submitted	08/10/01
Date Accepted	08/27/01 at OBF # 75
Initial Closure	10/14/04 at OBF # 88
Final Closure	12/08/04 at OBF #
Issue Category	RESOLVED

**Part B, Page 18
(Status History)**

Issue Title: Need for Accurate Jurisdictional Information for Accurate Billing

OBF #81, FEBRUARY 10-11, 2003

Ms. Thompson reviewed the Issue Statement as well as the Desired Results of this issue.

Based on information provided by Mr. Bill Krall (Telcordia) at OBF #80, the committee agreed to send a letter to Co-Chair, Bob Hall at T1S1, Co-Chair, Dana Smith, at the Industry Numbering Committee (INC) and Chair, James Grasser at the Wireless Number Portability Operations (WNPO) requesting additional information to determine Jurisdiction for Billing and Taxing.

The correspondence has been logged and posted to the OBF Correspondence Page as Reference Number 021216-001 and is also accessible via the following URL:

http://www.atis.org/ATIS/CLC/OBF/obf_corr.htm

Ms. Thompson advised the participants that response letters were received from Co-Chair, Dana Smith, at the INC, Co-Chair, Bob Hall of T1S1 as well as Co-Chair, Mr. Sean Hawkins, of WNPO. Ms. Thompson continued by reviewing the letters.

The correspondence has been logged and posted to the OBF Correspondence Page as Reference Numbers 030123-001, 030114-001 and 030206-001. These letters are also accessible via the following URL:

http://www.atis.org/ATIS/CLC/OBF/obf_corr.htm

After review of the correspondence, it appeared that Network Interconnection Interoperability Forum (NIIF) might be addressing the issue of populating Jurisdiction Information Parameter (JIP). Therefore, the participants reviewed proposed resolutions from NIIF Issues 208 and 215.

Ordering and Billing Forum Issue Identification Form

OBF Issue Number	2308
Date Submitted	08/10/01
Date Accepted	08/27/01 at OBF # 75
Initial Closure	10/14/04 at OBF # 88
Final Closure	12/08/04 at OBF #
Issue Category	RESOLVED

**Part B, Page 19
(Status History)**

Issue Title: Need for Accurate Jurisdictional Information for Accurate Billing

OBF #81, FEBRUARY 10-11, 2003 (CONTINUED)

A question was raised as to whether the wireless industry was required to provide the JIP. It was clarified that wireless providers were not required to populate JIP. In addition, it did not appear that there is anything in the works requiring JIP to be populated by all types of providers.

In order to move forward with this issue, it was agreed that a conference call would be scheduled with the WNPO, NIIF, INC and the Wireless Switching Standards body in order to identify current concerns and specific needs of this issue.

A letter will be drafted and be sent to all parties requesting a conference call. The letter will include issue background and proposed dates for the conference call.

The following participants volunteered to help draft the proposed letter:

Chris Sullivan, Verizon
DiAnne Nichol, Alltel
Martha Huizenga, Vibrant Solutions
Ramona Price, Price Waterhouse Coopers
Doug Mabie, Verizon
Janice Gallagher, AT&T

This issue will remain in OPEN status and be worked within the full Billing Committee.

Ordering and Billing Forum Issue Identification Form

OBF Issue Number	2308
Date Submitted	08/10/01
Date Accepted	08/27/01 at OBF # 75
Initial Closure	10/14/04 at OBF # 88
Final Closure	12/08/04 at OBF #
Issue Category	RESOLVED

Part B, Page 20
(Status History)

Issue Title: Need for Accurate Jurisdictional Information for Accurate Billing

OBF #82, MAY 19-20, 2003

Issue 2308 and 2349 were worked jointly. Ms. Mer Thompson (AT&T), Billing Committee Co-Leader, reviewed the Issue Identification Forms of both Issues 2308 and 2349.

Ms. Thompson stated that in order to move forward with this issue, a joint conference call was held on April 21, 2003 with the Wireless Number Portability Organization (WNPO), Network Interconnection Interoperability Forum (NIIF) and the Industry Numbering Committee (INC) in order to identify current concerns and specific needs of this issue.

During the call it was recommended that the Billing Committee forward a contribution to T1S1. Therefore, AT&T volunteered to submit a contribution to T1S1. (The contribution has been provided as Attachment 2308a3.)

After T1S1 reviewed the contribution, a correspondence was returned to the Billing Committee stating that there was no consensus to adopt any of the changes proposed in the contribution. The group had concluded that further information was required before proceeding. The correspondence has been logged and posted to the OBF Correspondence Page as Reference Number 030514-001 and is also accessible via the following URL: http://www.atis.org/ATIS/CLC/OBF/obf_corr.htm

It was suggested to draft a response letter to the T1S1 including a copy of the presentation with the fundamental needs.

Ordering and Billing Forum Issue Identification Form

OBF Issue Number	2308	
Date Submitted	08/10/01	
Date Accepted	08/27/01	at OBF # 75
Initial Closure	10/14/04	at OBF # 88
Final Closure	12/08/04	at OBF #
Issue Category	RESOLVED	

Part B, Page 21 (Status History)

Issue Title: Need for Accurate Jurisdictional Information for Accurate Billing

OBF #82 MAY 19-20, 2003 (CONTINUED)

The following participants volunteered to draft the proposed letter:

Mr. Larry Martin, TXU
Ms. Janice Gallagher, AT&T
Ms. Claudia Cavanaugh, SBC
Ms. DiAnne Nichol, Alltel
Ms. Nancy Webber, Sprint
Ms. Mer Thompson, AT&T
Mr. Charles Kirkman, Cox

A virtual meeting conference call has been scheduled among the small group in order to draft the letter on May 28, 2003 at 11:00 AM – 12:00 PM (ET). Ms. Thompson will host this call.

It was further suggested having some billing participants present at the Wireless Workshop.

Ms. Gallagher, Ms. Jill Blakeley, Mr. Martin and Ms. Thompson met with the Wireless Workshop to discuss Issues 2308 and 2349 and the Jurisdiction Information Parameter (JIP). Ms. Gallagher provided an overview of the business problem. The Wireless Workshop participants acknowledged the business problem and the following points were made:

Ordering and Billing Forum Issue Identification Form

OBF Issue Number	2308
Date Submitted	08/10/01
Date Accepted	08/27/01 at OBF # 75
Initial Closure	10/14/04 at OBF # 88
Final Closure	12/08/04 at OBF #
Issue Category	RESOLVED

**Part B, Page 22
(Status History)**

Issue Title: Need for Accurate Jurisdictional Information for Accurate Billing

OBF #82 MAY 19-20, 2003 (CONTINUED)

- Not all wireless switching offices are capable of providing JIP.
- JIP is an optional field.
- Implementation of JIP in all wireless switching offices will be costly.
- JIP would resolve much of the problem with jurisdictionalizing traveling and roaming wireless originated calls.
- Billing Committee representatives discussed next steps for Issues 2308 and 2349. Wireless Workshop participants suggested that the WNPO be included in the upcoming Billing Committee conference call to further discuss Issues 2308 and 2349 with T1S1 and other industry bodies.

This issue will remain in OPEN status and be worked within the full Billing Committee.

Ordering and Billing Forum Issue Identification Form

OBF Issue Number	2308
Date Submitted	08/10/01
Date Accepted	08/27/01 at OBF # 75
Initial Closure	10/14/04 at OBF # 88
Final Closure	12/08/04 at OBF #
Issue Category	RESOLVED

Part B, Page 23
(Status History)

Issue Title: Need for Accurate Jurisdictional Information for Accurate Billing

OBF #83 AUGUST 18-20, 2003

Issue 2308 and 2349 were worked jointly. Mr. Andy Plummer (Bell South), Issue Champion, reviewed the Issue Identification Form of this Issue.

Ms. Mer Thompson (AT&T), Co-Leader of the Billing Committee, stated that a letter was sent to T1S1 and other industry forums in order to determine if they could help the Billing Committee with their specific needs of this issue. A request for a conference call was made.

In response to the Billing Committee's request, a joint conference call was held on August 1, 2003 with other industry forums in order to identify current concerns and specific needs of this issue.

During the call it was recommended that the Billing Committee contact TR45.2 and T1P1 as these two committees are responsible for the signaling requirements for wireless.

Ms. Thompson stated that there had been discussion of looking at a short term and long term solution

- The short-term solution: JIP at MSC
- Long term solution - JIP at cell site level

There was concern that JIP at a cell site level may not happen for many years.

It was stated that if companies could get the JIP at MSC level it may work as a short term solution.

Ordering and Billing Forum Issue Identification Form

OBF Issue Number	2308
Date Submitted	08/10/01
Date Accepted	08/27/01 at OBF # 75
Initial Closure	10/14/04 at OBF # 88
Final Closure	12/08/04 at OBF #
Issue Category	RESOLVED

**Part B, Page 24
(Status History)**

Issue Title: Need for Accurate Jurisdictional Information for Accurate Billing

Participants felt that the immediate concern at this time is number portability and that JIP at cell site level is required.

OBF #83 AUGUST 18-20, 2003 (CONTINUED)

The group moved forward by reviewing the following NIIF Proposed Solution:

Subteam Final Draft

Informational Procedures for Jurisdiction Information Parameter (JIP)

The NIIF Reference Document (Issue 4.0, January 2002, Part X, (12)(A) indicates that the Jurisdiction Information Parameter (JIP) should be populated in the IAM on each call origination in a local number portability environment per T1.TRQ2-1999. Since this specification was contained in the Interconnection between LECs section of the handbook, it may have been understood to refer to only call origination from wireline LECs. It is also the case that the rules for JIP population per T1.TRQ2 (Number Portability – Switching Systems) and per T1.113 (ISUP) are not necessarily consistent, particularly in light of the implementation of the FCC’s NRO order. Accordingly, some background and clarifications are provided below.

Background

T1.113 defines the JIP as a 6-digit field in NPA-NXX format. Clause 2.1.10C/T1.113 includes the statements, “An originating exchange may optionally include the Jurisdiction Information parameter in the Initial Address Message. If included, the Jurisdiction Information parameter shall contain six digits representing the geographic location (NPA-NXX) of the call origination.” T1.113 gives no further guidance on the process of selecting a particular NPA-NXX to populate the JIP. T1.TRQ2 assumes that the NPA-NXX used to populate the JIP is LERG assigned to the switch. An IAM can include only one instance of the JIP.

Ordering and Billing Forum Issue Identification Form

OBF Issue Number	2308
Date Submitted	08/10/01
Date Accepted	08/27/01 at OBF # 75
Initial Closure	10/14/04 at OBF # 88
Final Closure	12/08/04 at OBF #
Issue Category	RESOLVED

Part B, Page 25
(Status History)

Issue Title: Need for Accurate Jurisdictional Information for Accurate Billing

OBF #83 AUGUST 18-20, 2003 (CONTINUED)

Since the JIP is not a mandatory parameter in ISUP, many carriers began to populate JIP only as a result of the implementation of LNP. Further, the level geographic specificity required by T1.113 is vague. The identification of the originating switch may be derived from the JIP, therefore many carriers currently populate the JIP with only a single value. In this case a JIP is an NPA-NXX assigned in the LERG to the switch, on all originating calls, even though the switch may serve an area encompassing multiple states or LATAs.¹ In a wireline environment with portability assumed to be restricted to within the rate center, Calling Party Number was deemed to provide the necessary information about the location of the caller as opposed to their originating switch. Also, while at one point in time a switch might have been expected to have a LERG-assigned NPA-NXX for each rate center that it served, this is no longer the case with the advent of thousands block number pooling. It has not been determined whether the location of the caller or location of the switch (switch identification) should be used as the basis for populating the JIP.

¹ T1.TRQ2 does require a different JIP value where remote switch modules are involved.
(2308.doc)

Ordering and Billing Forum Issue Identification Form

OBF Issue Number	2308
Date Submitted	08/10/01
Date Accepted	08/27/01 at OBF # 75
Initial Closure	10/14/04 at OBF # 88
Final Closure	12/08/04 at OBF #
Issue Category	RESOLVED

Part B, Page 26
(Status History)

Issue Title: Need for Accurate Jurisdictional Information for Accurate Billing

OBF #83 AUGUST 18-20, 2003 (CONTINUED)

Needs for the JIP

Currently, the JIP is needed in several circumstances:

1. The JIP remains necessary per T1.TRQ2 to identify the originating switch in an LNP environment, particularly where the originating end office is not directly connected with an IXC so that the IXC can determine how to render a bill and originating access charges.
2. On wireless calls originated from roaming subscribers, the JIP is needed to identify the point of call origination for proper access billing. The CPN cannot identify the point of call origin for roamers. The JIP will also be needed for an IXC to identify and bill the originating wireless carrier since CPN only identifies the subscriber's home carrier. ²
3. The JIP may also be needed to properly screen calls where the screening needs to be based on calling location as opposed to CPN, for example, calls from wireless roamers.
4. JIP may also be useful for jurisdictionalizing traffic for which the CPN is either unavailable or misleading. In such cases the JIP can help insure proper access billing. An example, may be where a carrier makes use of the enhanced service provider exemption to terminate traffic via a local business line.

² The OBF has specifically requested via liaison 030605-001 (T) that wireless carriers populated the JIP with an NPA-NXX specific to the state and LATA of the originating cell site.
(2308.doc)

Ordering and Billing Forum Issue Identification Form

OBF Issue Number	2308
Date Submitted	08/10/01
Date Accepted	08/27/01 at OBF # 75
Initial Closure	10/14/04 at OBF # 88
Final Closure	12/08/04 at OBF #
Issue Category	RESOLVED

**Part B, Page 27
(Status History)**

Issue Title: Need for Accurate Jurisdictional Information for Accurate Billing

OBF #83 AUGUST 18-20, 2003 (CONTINUED)

Rules for Populating JIP

1. JIP should be populated in the IAMs of all wireline and wireless originating calls where technically feasible.
2. JIP should be populated with an NPA-NXX that is assigned in the LERG to the originating switch.
3. The NIIF does not recommend proposing that the JIP parameter be mandatory since calls missing any mandatory parameter will be aborted. However, the NIIF strongly recommends that the JIP be populated on all calls where technologically possible.
4. Where technically feasible, the JIP should be populated with an NPA-NXX that is specific to the state and LATA of the caller. For wireless callers, this should be based on the originating cell site. In the cases where the subscriber is served remotely (different state/LATA) from the switch it has not been determined how the JIP should be populated.
5. Where the originating switch can not signal JIP, it is desirable that the subsequent switch in the call path populate the JIP using a data fill default associated with the incoming route. The value of the data fill item is an NPA-NXX associated with the originating switch and reflective of its location.
6. When call forwarding occurs, the forwarded from DN field will be populated. The JIP will be changed to a JIP associated with the forwarded from DN and the new called DN will be inserted in the IAM.
7. As per T1.TRQ2, the JIP should be reset when a new billable call leg is created. The issue of whether this should be construed to also apply in the

Ordering and Billing Forum Issue Identification Form

OBF Issue Number	2308
Date Submitted	08/10/01
Date Accepted	08/27/01 at OBF # 75
Initial Closure	10/14/04 at OBF # 88
Final Closure	12/08/04 at OBF #
Issue Category	RESOLVED

**Part B, Page 28
(Status History)**

Issue Title: Need for Accurate Jurisdictional Information for Accurate Billing

case of wireless call redirection to roaming subscribers, using a TLDN or MSRN, is pending input from the wireless community.

OBF #83 AUGUST 18-20, 2003 (CONTINUED)

After review, it was suggested forming an interested parties group to review the above rules in order to create a contribution to be forwarded to TR45.2 & TIP1.

The following participants volunteered to join the interested parties group:

Ms. Janice Gallagher, AT&T
Ms. DiAnne Nichol, ALLTEL
Ms. Dena Giessmann, ALLTEL
Mr. Stan Raaker, Cincinnati Bell
Ms. Maria Elshamy, Telcordia
Mr. Charles Kirkman, Cox Communications
Mr. Brett McAlpine, UDP
Ms. Judy Mutzenberger, Martin Group
Mr. Andy Plummer, BellSouth
Ms. Jill Blakeley, Time Warner
Ms. Dawn Coleman, ACM
Ms. Marjorie Scoda, Frontier
Ms. Martha Huizenga, Vibrant Solutions
Mr. Tom Makara, MCI
Ms. Joyce Helt, SBC
Ms. Claudia Schaefer, SBC
Mr. Shane Armstrong, EUR Systems
Ms. Crista Farrer, ICG Communications

Ordering and Billing Forum Issue Identification Form

OBF Issue Number	2308
Date Submitted	08/10/01
Date Accepted	08/27/01 at OBF # 75
Initial Closure	10/14/04 at OBF # 88
Final Closure	12/08/04 at OBF #
Issue Category	RESOLVED

Part B, Page 29
(Status History)

Issue Title: Need for Accurate Jurisdictional Information for Accurate Billing

Mr. Doug Mabie, Verizon
Ms. Tom Fitzsimons, Z-Tel

Ordering and Billing Forum Issue Identification Form

OBF Issue Number	2308
Date Submitted	08/10/01
Date Accepted	08/27/01 at OBF # 75
Initial Closure	10/14/04 at OBF # 88
Final Closure	12/08/04 at OBF #
Issue Category	RESOLVED

**Part B, Page 30
(Status History)**

Issue Title: Need for Accurate Jurisdictional Information for Accurate Billing

OBF #83 AUGUST 18-20, 2003 (CONTINUED)

The virtual meeting was scheduled for September 16, 2003 at 11:00 AM – 1:00 PM (ET). ALLTEL volunteered to host the call.

This issue will remain in OPEN status and be worked within the full Billing Committee.

OBF #84 NOVEMBER 17-19, 2003

Issues 2308 and 2349 were worked jointly. Mr. Andy Plummer (Bell South), Issue Champion, reviewed the Issue Identification Form of these issues.

Ms. Khristine Manzoli, Billing Committee Administrator, recapped the following interim activity of these issues:

- A virtual meeting conference call was held on September 16, 2003. In order for the Billing Committee participants to review correspondence, which included a proposed solution received from NIIF and for the participants to create a response to be forwarded to NIIF and other associated forums.

The correspondence has been logged and posted to the OBF correspondence page as Reference Number 030910-001 and is accessible via the following URLs:

http://www.atis.org/ATIS/CLC/OBF/obf_corr.htm

<http://www.atis.org/pub/clc/obf/corresp/030910001r.doc>

The participants reviewed the correspondence and drafted a response letter along with comments to NIIF and associated forums regarding the proposed solution.

Ordering and Billing Forum Issue Identification Form

OBF Issue Number	2308
Date Submitted	08/10/01
Date Accepted	08/27/01 at OBF # 75
Initial Closure	10/14/04 at OBF # 88
Final Closure	12/08/04 at OBF #
Issue Category	RESOLVED

**Part B, Page 31
(Status History)**

Issue Title: Need for Accurate Jurisdictional Information for Accurate Billing

OBF #84 NOVEMBER 17-19, 2003 (CONTINUED)

The correspondence has been logged and posted to the OBF Correspondence Page as Reference Number 030930-001 and is accessible the following links:

http://www.atis.org/ATIS/CLC/OBF/obf_corr.htm

<http://www.atis.org/pub/clc/obf/corresp/030930001t.pdf>

- A virtual meeting was held on October 1, 2003. The Billing Committee participants reviewed correspondence received from Committee TIA TR.45. The correspondence has been logged and posted to the OBF correspondence page as Reference Number 030912-001 and is accessible via the following URLs:

http://www.atis.org/ATIS/CLC/OBF/obf_corr.htm

<http://www.atis.org/pub/clc/obf/corresp/030912001r.doc>

After review of the correspondence, it was suggested responding to the TIA TR.45 and asking for an interim MSC solution until further investigation.

- A virtual meeting conference call was held on October 16, 2003 in order to draft a response letter to the TIA TR.45. However, companies needed more time and information before responding. Therefore, it was agreed to defer this response letter until OBF #84.
- Correspondence 031107-001 was sent to NIIF from TIA TR.45, copying the OBF Billing Committee, regarding NIIF's correspondence of September 10, 2003 Number 030910-001, regarding NIIF Issue Number 0208.

Ordering and Billing Forum Issue Identification Form

OBF Issue Number	2308
Date Submitted	08/10/01
Date Accepted	08/27/01 at OBF # 75
Initial Closure	10/14/04 at OBF # 88
Final Closure	12/08/04 at OBF #
Issue Category	RESOLVED

**Part B, Page 32
(Status History)**

Issue Title: Need for Accurate Jurisdictional Information for Accurate Billing

The correspondence has been logged and posted to the OBF Correspondence Page as Reference Number 031107-001 and is also accessible via the following URL:

OBF #84 NOVEMBER 17-19, 2003 (CONTINUED)

http://www.atis.org/ATIS/CLC/OBF/obf_corr.htm

Ms. Webber (Sprint) stated that Sprint had some concerns with the letter and is currently working on submitting a contribution to the TR.45.2 in order to pursue JIP as a standard.

It was stated that if companies could get the JIP at the MSC level it may work as a short-term solution. However, the long-term solution is to get JIP at the cell site level. There was a concern that if a short-term solution is provided at this time, there may be a problem with achieving the long-term solution.

It was agreed that a response letter needed to be drafted and sent back to TR.45.2. It was suggested sending a response letter thanking them for their response and letting them know that companies are doing further research at this time and that the Billing Committee would get back to them at a later time.

Participants were encouraged to talk with their company's TR45.2 representatives in order to move this issue toward a long-term solution.

It was questioned whether or not ATIS could get involved with these issues in order to help move them along and end the correspondence back and forth. Ms. Webber and Ms. Thompson volunteered to talk with ATIS Leadership to see if they could help the Billing Committee move these issues to amicable resolutions.

Ordering and Billing Forum Issue Identification Form

OBF Issue Number	2308
Date Submitted	08/10/01
Date Accepted	08/27/01 at OBF # 75
Initial Closure	10/14/04 at OBF # 88
Final Closure	12/08/04 at OBF #
Issue Category	RESOLVED

**Part B, Page 33
(Status History)**

Issue Title: Need for Accurate Jurisdictional Information for Accurate Billing

OBF #84 NOVEMBER 17-19, 2003 (CONTINUED)

Ms. Thompson, Ms. Jill Blakeley (Time Warner) and Mr. Charles Kirkman (Cox Communications) arranged a meeting to speak with Mr. Mike Norris (MP Guidance), OBF Moderator; Mr. Chris Read (SBC), OBF Assistant Moderator; and Mr. John Pautlitz, ATIS Director of Industry Forums-OBF. After this meeting Ms. Blakeley, Mr. Kirkman and Ms. Thompson agreed to provide feedback to the committee within these notes.

Mr. Kirkman, Ms. Blakeley and Ms. Thompson met with Mr. Pautlitz, Mr. Read, Mr. Norris, Mr. Dean Grady, Ms. Yvonne Reigle and Ms. Alissa Medley, ATIS/OBF Project Manager to discuss direction for reaching a resolution for Issues 2308 and 2349. Mr. Pautlitz will investigate the relationship between ATIS and TIA. In addition, Mr. Pautlitz will work with Ms. Megan Campbell (ATIS General Council), Ms. Susan Miller (ATIS President), Mr. Ed Hall (ATIS Vice President Technology Development) and Ms. Toni Haddix (ATIS Staff Attorney) to establish a direction for reaching a resolution for Issues 2308 and 2349. Mr. Pautlitz will provide a response/update to Ms. Nancy Webber and Mr. Kirkman by December 5, 2003.

It was also questioned whether verbiage could be added in the MECAB Document for jurisdiction for taxing purposes.

This issue will remain in OPEN status and be worked within the full Billing Committee.

Ordering and Billing Forum Issue Identification Form

OBF Issue Number	2308
Date Submitted	08/10/01
Date Accepted	08/27/01 at OBF # 75
Initial Closure	10/14/04 at OBF # 88
Final Closure	12/08/04 at OBF #
Issue Category	RESOLVED

**Part B, Page 34
(Status History)**

Issue Title: Need for Accurate Jurisdictional Information for Accurate Billing

OBF #85, FEBRUARY 9-12, 2004

Issues 2308 and 2349 were worked jointly. Mr. Andy Plummer (Bell South), Issue Champion, reviewed the Issue Identification Form of these issues.

Ms. Webber recapped the following interim activity of these issues:

- It was questioned whether or not ATIS could get involved with these issues to help move them along and end the correspondence back and forth.
- Billing co-leaders met with Mr. John Pautlitz (ATIS/OBF Director), Mr. Chris Read (OBF Moderator), Mr. Mike Norris, Mr. Dean Grady, Ms. Yvonne Reigle (OBF Team Manager) and Ms. Alissa Medley (ATIS/OBF Project Manager) to discuss direction for reaching a resolution for Issues 2308 and 2349. Mr. Pautlitz will investigate the relationship between ATIS and TIA. In addition, Mr. Pautlitz will work with Ms. Megan Campbell (ATIS General Counsel), Ms. Susan Miller (ATIS President), Mr. Ed Hall (ATIS Vice President Technology Development) and Ms. Toni Haddix (ATIS Staff Attorney) to establish a direction for reaching a resolution for Issues 2308 and 2349. Mr. Pautlitz will provide a response/update to Ms. Nancy Webber and Mr. Kirkman by December 5, 2003.
- Mr. Pautlitz advised the Billing Committee Co-Leaders that while Ms. Haddix and Ms. Campbell were researching the JIP issue, their investigation led them to recent meeting notes from NIIF/NIOC, which appear as though the issue is not closed, potentially affording the opportunity for additional dialogue and resolution. (The sections of the notes that apply to the JIP issue have been pasted below for your review.) Mr. Pautlitz asked if the committee could take a look at the notes to determine if the committee wanted to meet with representatives from NIIF/NIOC, and if so, Mr. Pautlitz would arrange for a conference call with the appropriate people.

Ordering and Billing Forum Issue Identification Form

OBF Issue Number	2308
Date Submitted	08/10/01
Date Accepted	08/27/01 at OBF # 75
Initial Closure	10/14/04 at OBF # 88
Final Closure	12/08/04 at OBF #
Issue Category	RESOLVED

Part B, Page 35
(Status History)

Issue Title: Need for Accurate Jurisdictional Information for Accurate Billing

OBF #85, FEBRUARY 9-12, 2004 (CONTINUED)

**Notes from the Network Interconnection Interoperability Forum (NIIF)
Network Inter-operability Committee (NIOC)
January 13-15, 2004
NIOC #42 Meeting record**

• **Issue #0208: Jurisdiction Information Parameter (Attachment #15)**

Participants reviewed the Issue Statement of Issue #0208.

- **#040114-001: Correspondence from Cheryl Blum TR 45.2 regarding NIIF Issue #0208, Jurisdiction Information Parameter (JIP)**

Participants reviewed correspondence from Cheryl Blum TR 45.2 regarding NIIF Issue #0208, Jurisdiction Information Parameter (JIP) (**Attachment #16**).

Action Item:

4. Veronica Lancaster will post the correspondence from Cheryl Blum TR 45.2 regarding NIIF Issue #0208, Jurisdiction Information Parameter (JIP) to the NIIF Correspondence Received web page as NIIF Correspondence #040114-001.

Points Noted:

- A participant interpreted the correspondence to state that TR45.2 would not be opposed to sending the JIP where the technology allowed the JIP to be sent.

Ordering and Billing Forum Issue Identification Form

OBF Issue Number	2308
Date Submitted	08/10/01
Date Accepted	08/27/01 at OBF # 75
Initial Closure	10/14/04 at OBF # 88
Final Closure	12/08/04 at OBF #
Issue Category	RESOLVED

**Part B, Page 36
(Status History)**

Issue Title: Need for Accurate Jurisdictional Information for Accurate Billing

- It was noted that wireless companies are beginning to discuss the possibility of populating JIP information.

OBF #85, FEBRUARY 9-12, 2004 (CONTINUED)

- It was noted that the NIIF should review all correspondence received to determine if the Issue #0208 sub team should schedule a meeting to edit the Issue #0208 developmental text based on the correspondence received.
- Sprint noted that Sprint's TR45.2 representative is going to bring in an issue to TR45.2 related to the JIP.
- It was suggested that a response to TR45.2 and other industry groups may be necessary upon further working on Issue #0208 to notify industry groups of future NIIF decisions on Issue #0208.
- It was noted that the NIIF should reconsider previous consensus agreements that the JIP should be populated on the basis of the originating cell site.
 - **#031102-001: Resend of NIIF Correspondence #030910-002 and request for review of draft text that could be inserted into the NIIF Reference Document regarding the current views and open discussion items for NIIF Issue #0208 (JIP)**

Participants reviewed correspondence from NIIF to the NANC requesting review of draft text that could be inserted into the NIIF Reference Document regarding the current views and open discussion items for NIIF Issue #0208 (JIP) (**Attachment #17**). Correspondence #030910-002 was resent with this correspondence. This correspondence was posted as #031102-001 on the NIIF Correspondence web page.

Ordering and Billing Forum Issue Identification Form

OBF Issue Number	2308
Date Submitted	08/10/01
Date Accepted	08/27/01 at OBF # 75
Initial Closure	10/14/04 at OBF # 88
Final Closure	12/08/04 at OBF #
Issue Category	RESOLVED

**Part B, Page 37
(Status History)**

Issue Title: Need for Accurate Jurisdictional Information for Accurate Billing

OBF #85, FEBRUARY 9-12, 2004 (CONTINUED)

Points Noted:

- It was noted that the NANC informed the NIIF Co Chair that they have reached agreement that the WNPO and NIIF may correspond directly.
- It was noted that prior to the NANC meeting, the WNPO indicated that the JIP information does not apply to the WNPO.

- **#031125-001: Liaison Response from T1S1 to NIIF Developing Informational Text as a result of NIIF Issue #0208**

Participants reviewed correspondence from the T1S1 to NIIF in response to NIIF Developing Informational Text as a result of NIIF Issue #0208. (**Attachment #18**). This correspondence was posted as #031125-001 on the NIIF Correspondence web page.

Points Noted:

- It was noted that there was some pushback at T1S1 on NIIF rule 1 that JIP should be populated in intranetwork calls. Some T1S1 participants believed that within their own network, it was not necessary to populate the JIP. Other T1S1 participants strongly felt that the JIP should be populated at all times.
- It was noted that T1S1 supports rule 5, but feels that rule 5 could lessen the importance of rule 1, which states that the JIP must be populated.

Ordering and Billing Forum Issue Identification Form

OBF Issue Number	2308
Date Submitted	08/10/01
Date Accepted	08/27/01 at OBF # 75
Initial Closure	10/14/04 at OBF # 88
Final Closure	12/08/04 at OBF #
Issue Category	RESOLVED

Part B, Page 38
(Status History)

Issue Title: Need for Accurate Jurisdictional Information for Accurate Billing

OBF #85, FEBRUARY 9-12, 2004 (CONTINUED)

- It was noted that there are some in the industry that believe that populating JIP is only necessary on wireline LNP calls and does not apply to wireless LNP calls. If this belief continues and the industry feels there is a need, T1S1 would be willing to consider addressing a standard on populating JIP on Basic Call.
- It was noted that T1S1 copied OBF, WNPO, TR45.2, T1P1, and CTIA in their response the NIIF.
- A participant asked if T1S1 discussed JIP granularity at the cell site level. In response, it was noted that T1S1 did not.
- It was suggested that the Issue #0208 sub team be reconvened to discuss correspondence, invite subject matter experts, and discuss editing the draft text for Issue #0208.
- It was noted that after the NIIF has reviewed recent industry correspondence related to Issue #0208, it was suggested that the rules related to JIP be considered for modification to agree with the positions of other industry bodies. It was further suggested that the rules may need to be amended in the area of what is populated in the JIP to satisfy billing concerns.
- It was suggested that the rules of JIP be reviewed during NIOC #42 should time permit.
- A participant suggested that the NIIF should document the rules for populating JIP within the NIIF Reference Document.

Ordering and Billing Forum Issue Identification Form

OBF Issue Number	2308
Date Submitted	08/10/01
Date Accepted	08/27/01 at OBF # 75
Initial Closure	10/14/04 at OBF # 88
Final Closure	12/08/04 at OBF #
Issue Category	RESOLVED

**Part B, Page 39
(Status History)**

Issue Title: Need for Accurate Jurisdictional Information for Accurate Billing

- **#040114-002: Correspondence from the WNPO in response to NIIF Correspondence requesting review of NIIF Developmental text**

OBF #85, FEBRUARY 9-12, 2004 (CONTINUED)

Participants reviewed correspondence from the WNPO in response to NIIF Correspondence requesting review of NIIF Developmental text. (**Attachment #19**). This correspondence will be posted as #040114-002 on the NIIF Correspondence web page.

Action Item:

5. Veronica Lancaster will post the correspondence from the WNPO in response to NIIF Correspondence requesting review of NIIF draft text to the NIIF Correspondence Received web page as NIIF Correspondence #040114-002.

Points Noted:

- A participant noted concern regarding the WNPO position that they do not see Issue #0208 as an LNP specific issue. It was noted that NIIF may not have been clear in initial correspondence to the WNPO regarding the purpose of the draft text for Issue #0208.
- A participant asked why the NIIF is interested in the opinion of the WNPO. In response, it was noted that the wireless industry is not populating JIP. It was noted that the intention of the correspondence was to gain the interest of the wireless industry regarding how the JIP should be populated.
- It was suggested that the NIIF ask the WNPO if they follow the T1 standard, TRQ2 for LNP.

Ordering and Billing Forum Issue Identification Form

OBF Issue Number	2308
Date Submitted	08/10/01
Date Accepted	08/27/01 at OBF # 75
Initial Closure	10/14/04 at OBF # 88
Final Closure	12/08/04 at OBF #
Issue Category	RESOLVED

**Part B, Page 40
(Status History)**

Issue Title: Need for Accurate Jurisdictional Information for Accurate Billing

OBF #85, FEBRUARY 9-12, 2004 (CONTINUED)

- A participant asked what the NIIF hopes to gain from the WNPO by sending them correspondence related to JIP. In response, it was noted that the NIIF's expectation is that the industry would abide by the guidelines issued by the NIIF. It was further noted that members of the WNPO would be using the guidelines issued by the NIIF.
- It was noted that because the JIP is not explicitly called out in T1P1 standards, some wireless companies may interpret this to mean that they do not have to populate the JIP. It was noted that the correspondence is part of an effort to make the WNPO aware of the importance of populating the JIP.
- Robin asked if there was any objection to reconvening the Issue #0208 sub team. There was no objection.

Agreement Reached:

- Participants agreed to reconvene the Issue #0208 sub team.

Action Items:

- A meeting of the Issue #0208 sub team is necessary. Based on a review of activities by other industry bodies, the NIIF rules for populating JIP need to be revisited by considering the population of JIP at the state/LATA level, MSC, or means consistent with other industry work.
- A conference call for the Issue #0208 sub team meeting will be held on February 10, 2004, from 10:00 am – 12:00 pm Eastern. The bridge for the call is 312-814-9057 and the pin is 6628608#. Administrative support is not required for this call.

Ordering and Billing Forum Issue Identification Form

OBF Issue Number	2308
Date Submitted	08/10/01
Date Accepted	08/27/01 at OBF # 75
Initial Closure	10/14/04 at OBF # 88
Final Closure	12/08/04 at OBF #
Issue Category	RESOLVED

**Part B, Page 41
(Status History)**

Issue Title: Need for Accurate Jurisdictional Information for Accurate Billing

- Robin Meier will send a notification to Issue #0208 sub team members announcing details for the February 10, 2004 Issue #0208 sub-team conference call.

Ordering and Billing Forum Issue Identification Form

OBF Issue Number	2308
Date Submitted	08/10/01
Date Accepted	08/27/01 at OBF # 75
Initial Closure	10/14/04 at OBF # 88
Final Closure	12/08/04 at OBF #
Issue Category	RESOLVED

**Part B, Page 42
(Status History)**

Issue Title: Need for Accurate Jurisdictional Information for Accurate Billing

OBF #85, FEBRUARY 9-12, 2004 (CONTINUED)

- Veronica Lancaster will post the Issue #0208 sub team conference call information on the NIIF Conference Call Calendar web page and send corresponding exploder list messages.

Agreement Reached:

It was agreed that Issue #0208 would remain in Active status.

After recapping, Ms. Webber asked participants if there was concurrence to have interested parties from the Billing Committee schedule a joint conference call with the appropriate parties.

Consensus was met to schedule a conference call with interested parties to pursue this issue. Ms. Khristine Manzoli, Committee Administrator, will advise Mr. Pautlitz that the Billing Committee would like to arrange a conference call with the appropriate parties.

This issue will remain in OPEN status and be worked within the full Billing Committee.

Ordering and Billing Forum Issue Identification Form

OBF Issue Number	2308
Date Submitted	08/10/01
Date Accepted	08/27/01 at OBF # 75
Initial Closure	10/14/04 at OBF # 88
Final Closure	12/08/04 at OBF #
Issue Category	RESOLVED

Part B, Page 43
(Status History)

Issue Title: Need for Accurate Jurisdictional Information for Accurate Billing

OBF #86, MAY 17-19, 2004

Issues 2308 and 2349 were worked jointly. Mr. Webber recapped the following interim activity of these issues:

- A Conference Call was held on March 19, 2004 with co-chairs of ATIS OBF and NIOC in order to determine a path forward for these issues. It was agreed that Mr. Stuart Goldman (Lucent) T1S1.3 Chair would submit a contribution to the NIOC asking them for approval to have him act as a liaison to T1S1.3. If approved, Mr. Goldman will bring a recommendation to T1S1.3 stating that “the T1S1 T1.113 text could be more explicit that the JIP parameter should always be sent.”
- Correspondence was received from the NIOC, a NIIF Committee, regarding a request for comments on revised informational text being developed as a result of NIIF Issue #0208, Jurisdiction Information Parameter (JIP). The correspondence has been logged and posted to the OBF Correspondence Page as Reference Number 042904-001 and is accessible the following links:

<http://www.atis.org/obf/correspondence.asp>
<http://www.atis.org/pub/clc/obf/042904001.doc>

- In addition, correspondence was received from the NIOC, a NIIF Committee, regarding a request that the T1S1 T1.113 text be more explicit regarding the Jurisdiction Information Parameter (JIP). The correspondence has been logged and posted to the OBF Correspondence Page as Reference Number 041504-002 and is accessible the following links:

<http://www.atis.org/obf/correspondence.asp>
<http://www.atis.org/obf/mem/docs/041504002.pdf>

Ordering and Billing Forum Issue Identification Form

OBF Issue Number	2308
Date Submitted	08/10/01
Date Accepted	08/27/01 at OBF # 75
Initial Closure	10/14/04 at OBF # 88
Final Closure	12/08/04 at OBF #
Issue Category	RESOLVED

**Part B, Page 44
(Status History)**

Issue Title: Need for Accurate Jurisdictional Information for Accurate Billing

OBF #86, MAY 17-19, 2004 (CONTINUED)

- Correspondence was received from T1S1 regarding proposed JIP population rules and has been posted to the ATIS OBF Website. This correspondence may be accessed via the following URLs:

http://www.atis.org/ATIS/CLC/OBF/obf_corr.htm

<http://www.atis.org/pub/CLC/obf/040513001.pdf>

After recapping the issue, it was suggested forming an “interested parties” group to draft a response to the correspondence received. A virtual meeting was scheduled for Wednesday, May 26, 2004 at 11:00 AM – 1:00 PM (ET).

Ms. Webber volunteered to host the virtual meeting. The virtual meeting information is as follows:

Conference Call Number: 866-846-6193/816-650-7802

Pass Code Number: 2060490

This issue will remain in OPEN status and be worked within the full Billing Committee.

Ordering and Billing Forum Issue Identification Form

OBF Issue Number	2308
Date Submitted	08/10/01
Date Accepted	08/27/01 at OBF # 75
Initial Closure	10/14/04 at OBF # 88
Final Closure	12/08/04 at OBF #
Issue Category	RESOLVED

**Part B, Page 45
(Status History)**

Issue Title: Need for Accurate Jurisdictional Information for Accurate Billing

OBF #87, AUGUST 9-11, 2004

Issues 2308 and 2349 were worked jointly. Ms. Webber recapped the following interim activity of these issues:

- A letter was sent from the Billing Committee to NIOC in response to their letter dated April 28, 2004, requesting review and comments on the draft informational Procedures for Jurisdiction Information Parameter (JIP).

This correspondence may be accessed via the following URLs:

<http://www.atis.org/obf/correspondence.asp>
http://www.atis.org/obf/_mem/docs/052804001.doc

- The NIIF NIOC had received responses regarding the 7 Rules of JIP. The only change proposed to the rules was that TR 45 asked that a second sentence be added to Rule 4.
- The Billing Committee reviewed the alternative text and expressed concern that this may only be a partial solution. After some discussion, it was agreed to accept the proposed change.

New Proposed Language:

Where technically feasible if the originating wireline/wireless switch serves multiple states/LATAs, then the switch should support multiple JIPs such that the JIP used for a given call can be populated with an NPA-NXX that is specific to both the switch as well as the state and LATA of the caller.

Ordering and Billing Forum Issue Identification Form

OBF Issue Number	2308
Date Submitted	08/10/01
Date Accepted	08/27/01 at OBF # 75
Initial Closure	10/14/04 at OBF # 88
Final Closure	12/08/04 at OBF #
Issue Category	RESOLVED

**Part B, Page 46
(Status History)**

Issue Title: Need for Accurate Jurisdictional Information for Accurate Billing

OBF #87, AUGUST 9-11, 2004 (Continued)

If the JIP cannot be populated at the state and LATA level and it is technically feasible, then the JIP should be populated with an NPA-NXX specific to the originating switch.

- Ms. Webber and Mr. Kirkman volunteered to draft the response correspondence to NIIF NIOC.

This issue will remain in OPEN status and be worked within the full Billing Committee.

OBF #88, OCTOBER 11-14, 2004

Issues 2308 and 2349 were worked jointly. Mr. Kirkman recapped the following interim activity of these issues:

- The NIIF/NIOC had received responses regarding the 7 Rules of JIP. The only change proposed to the rules was that TR 45 asked that a second sentence be added to Rule 4.
- The Billing Committee reviewed the alternative text and expressed concern that this may only be a partial solution. After some discussion, it was agreed to accept the proposed change.

New Proposed Language:

Where technically feasible if the originating wireline/wireless switch serves multiple states/LATAs, then the switch should support multiple JIPs such that

Ordering and Billing Forum Issue Identification Form

OBF Issue Number	2308
Date Submitted	08/10/01
Date Accepted	08/27/01 at OBF # 75
Initial Closure	10/14/04 at OBF # 88
Final Closure	12/08/04 at OBF #
Issue Category	RESOLVED

**Part B, Page 47
(Status History)**

Issue Title: Need for Accurate Jurisdictional Information for Accurate Billing

the JIP used for a given call can be populated with an NPA-NXX that is specific to both the switch as well as the state and LATA of the caller.

If the JIP cannot be populated at the state and LATA level and it is technically feasible, then the JIP should be populated with an NPA-NXX specific to the originating switch.

- The Billing Committee Co-Chairs drafted a response correspondence to NIIF/NIOC in regard to their request to review and submit comments on the draft informational Procedures for Jurisdiction Information Parameter (JIP).

This correspondence may be accessed via the following URLs:

<http://www.atis.org/obf/correspondence.asp>
http://www.atis.org/obf/_mem/docs/052804001.doc

- A NIIF conference call was held on September 29th and suggested changes were proposed and approved to Rule 4.

Where technically feasible if the originating switch or MSC serves multiple states/LATAs, then the switch should support multiple JIPs such that the JIP used for a given call can be populated with an NPA-NXX that is specific to both the switch as well as the state and LATA of the caller.

If the JIP cannot be populated at the state and LATA level and it is technically feasible, then the JIP should be populated with an NPA-NXX specific to the originating switch or MSC where it is technically feasible.

Ordering and Billing Forum Issue Identification Form

OBF Issue Number	2308
Date Submitted	08/10/01
Date Accepted	08/27/01 at OBF # 75
Initial Closure	10/14/04 at OBF # 88
Final Closure	12/08/04 at OBF #
Issue Category	RESOLVED

**Part B, Page 48
(Status History)**

Issue Title: Need for Accurate Jurisdictional Information for Accurate Billing

The NIIF Committee stated that they will put their issue into initial closure after all feedback has been captured. If we are in agreement, we can put our issue into initial pending closure until NIIF's issue goes to Final Closure.

The Billing Committee reviewed the seven rules for populating and agreed with the changes that NIIF had made.

Mr. Kirkman reviewed the proposed resolution.

After review of the proposed Resolution Statement, there being no further discussion on this issue, consensus was reached to put this issue into **Initial Pending Status**.

November 17, 2004

Since NIIF 0208 has moved to Final Closure, The Billing Committee Issues 2308 is now in Initial Closure, from Initial Pending.

DECEMBER 8, 2004 –

21 DAYS HAVE PASSED SINCE THS ISSUE'S INITIAL CLOSURE RESOLUTION WAS POSTED ON THE ATIS WEBSITE AND NOTIFICATION OF INITIAL CLOSURE WAS DISTRIBUTED VIA EMAIL EXPLODER LIST. HAVING NO OBJECTIONS, THIS ISSUE HAS NOW BEEN PLACED INTO **FINAL CLOSURE**.

ATTACHMENT C

NIIF ISSUE IDENTIFICATION FORM ISSUE TITLE: JURISDICTION INFORMATION PARAMETER (JIP)

ISSUE ORIGINATOR: Leonard Chun

COMPANY: Sprint LDD

TELEPHONE: 913-534-2164

FAX#:

E-MAIL ADDRESS: leonard.chun@mail.sprint.com

ISSUE #:0208

FORMER ISSUE#:

DATE ACCEPTED: 4/17/02

COMMITTEE ASSIGNED: NIOC

CURRENT STATUS: Final Closure

RESOLUTION DATE: 11/12/04

ISSUE CHAMPIONS:

(optional)

REQUESTED RESOLUTION DATE:

Is this an ESP Request (Y/N)

ISSUE STATEMENT: The NIIF needs to ensure that interconnection and interoperability of the network be maintained by service providers to transmit accurate jurisdiction information from an access tandem or an originating office switch for roaming, LNP, and number pooling calls. Lack of or incorrect jurisdiction information involving local and interexchange call details may cause improper rating/routing and improper tax assessments.

SUGGESTED RESOLUTION: The NIIF has identified the JIP requirements relating to LNP calling (Issue 151, May 2000). To expand this requirement for wireless calling, the NIIF should require wireless companies to provide JIP parameters for roaming, LNP, and number pooling.

These requirements are noted in T1S1: TRQ 01, 02, 03, 04.

Additional information should describe the generated parameters for the JIP and the requirements for call rating/routing.

The JIP is used in a roaming wireless call to identify the geographic location of the originating MSC switch to distinguish the call as an inter/intra state call.

The JIP should contains six BCD-encoded digits of the form NPA-NXX corresponding to the geographic location from which the call originated (or is forwarded). The JIP is expected when its contents are needed for call rating/routing purpose.

When the JIP is to be generated by the AT, instead of the originating exchange, the JIP shall be generated based on the incoming trunk group. One NXX should be provided for this purpose, though the originating office may serve several NXX codes.

The JIP should be passed to the terminating office for billing purposes. The JIP should be referenced for call rating/routing purpose instead of the calling party number field. Business arrangements may be required between service providers to forward such call rating/routing information.

REFERENCES (if any): TR45.2, T1S1's TRQ 01, 02, 03, 04. ANSI T1-113.3,

OTHER IMPACTS (if any): The OBF has an issue (OBF Issue #2308) and correspondence (OBF Reference: 011120-01) requesting Standards Committee for "Recording and Signaling Changes Required to support Billing", NIIF to T1S1 correspondence 020206-001

CURRENT ACTIVITY:

April 15-17, 2002, NIOC #33

Agreement Reached

The NIOC agreed to accept "Jurisdiction Information Parameter" as NIIF Issue #0208.

April 18, 2002, General Session #34

Agreements Reached

NIOC Chairs will point out in future discussions, the possible ramifications of the activities cited in NIIF Correspondence #020206-001 as they relate to Issue #0208.

Participants are encouraged to develop a contribution generating relevant information about JIP abstracted from the TR45-2 be developed for presentation at NIIF #34.

NIOC #34, June 12-13, 2002

Action Items:

NIOC Co-Chairs will point out in future discussions, the possible ramifications of the activities cited in NIIF Correspondence #020206-001 as they relate to Issue #0208.

Participants are encouraged to develop a contribution generating relevant information about JIP abstracted from the TR45-2 for presentation at NIIF #34.

ATIS will contact the ESIF Director concerning the omission of NIIF from the recent ESIF distribution regarding the establishment of formal liaisons with industry forums.

Correspondence will be drafted to CTIA, WNPO, a copy to the NANC chair, CSCN, USTA, GSM North America, and a regulatory body. **SECRETARY'S NOTE:** *Other industry bodies were added during the drafting of the letter during NIOC #34.*

Agreement Reached:

Participants agreed to accept the correspondence drafted regarding Issue #0208.

Action Items:

Issue #0208 correspondence will be forwarded to NIIF General Session for review.

ATIS will insert the review of this correspondence on the proposed NIIF General Session agenda.

Agreements Reached:

Participants agreed to accept the resolution statement.

During minutes review, it was agreed to remove the words "rest of the" from the resolution statement.

It was agreed that Issue #0208 will be placed in initial closure.

NIOC #35, August 26-28, 2002

NOTE: No discussion was held regarding Issue #0208 as it was in initial closure during this meeting cycle.

General Session #35, August 29, 2002

Bob Amling (Telcorida Technologies) reviewed NIIF Issue #0208, Jurisdictional Information Parameter (JIP) (Attachment 15) and a letter intended for distribution, upon final closure of the issue (Attachment 16). The NIIF modified the Issue #0208 correspondence (Attachment 17).

Stu asked if there was any objection to accepting the NIIF Issue #0208 correspondence. There was none.

Agreement Reached:

6. The NIIF agreed to accept and forward the NIIF Issue #0208 correspondence.

Stu asked if there was any objection to placing NIIF Issue #0208 in final closure with the following resolution statement and letter.

The NIIF has agreed that the importance of the JIP parameter needs to be communicated to the industry and has further agreed to send the letter below:

June 14, 2002

CTIA
WNPO
CSCN
USTA
GSM North America
NARUC

NANC Chair
PCIA
CDMA Development Group
Universal Wireless Communications Consortium
NTCA

Dear :

The Network Interconnection and Interoperability Forum (NIIF) is a telecommunications industry forum which operates under the auspices of the Alliance for Telecommunications Industry Solutions. The forum addresses issues on various topics of concern to the telecommunications industry, including network reliability.

In this regard, NIIF is sending this letter to remind the industry of the importance of correctly populating the Jurisdictional Information Parameter (JIP) in the SS7 IAM message. This requirement applies equally to both wireline and wireless service providers.

Lack of or incorrect jurisdiction information involving intra and interLATA call details may cause improper rating/routing and improper tax assessments. The lack of a JIP may result in the reliance on another field such as the Calling Party DN; this could result in incorrect screening and may cause call failure.

For further information on JIP, please refer to T1.113 INSERT DOCUMENT NAME and Committee TR45.2 under the TIA??? (VERIFY).

Sincerely,

*Stu Goldman
NIIF Moderator*

SBC objected to the closing of Issue #0208 on the following basis:

"SBC objects to the final closure of NIIF Issue 208 but does not object to the sending of the letter to the industry communicating the importance of the Jurisdictional Information Parameter (JIP). JIP could assist in determining the physical location of the wireless subscriber for not only wireless to wireline traffic but also wireline to wireless traffic. SBC's objection is based on its belief that more detailed work is required on this subject, especially as related to sending JIP from the terminating wireless service provider back to the originating wireline service provider. If JIP is to be utilized by the industry in the future both originating and terminating wireless traffic must be identified. In addition to NIIF, SBC intends to pursue this issue via other industry forums and groups. A total solution should be encouraged, including appropriate agreement and/or tariff changes, before any final closure is agreed to, or any partial adoption of JIP is undertaken in the industry."

Stu called for consensus on the status of NIIF Issue #0208.

Agreement Reached:

7. The NIIF reached consensus on the agreement to remand NIIF Issue #0208 back to the NIOC and to send the accompanying correspondence, as modified.

Action Items:

15. Nicole will add Issue #0208 to the NIOC #36 agenda.
16. Nicole will forward the Issue #0208 correspondence to the CLC, as modified.
17. Upon CLC approval, the correspondence related to Issue #0208 will be sent on.
18. NIIF participants are encouraged to provide contributions to NIIF Issue #0208 for discussion and during NIOC #36.

NIOC #36 – October 16-17, 2002

Action Item:

10. Participants will review the SBC contribution to Issue #0208 and be prepared to discuss the contribution at NIOC #37.

Points Noted:

80. It was suggested that all requirement references be deleted from the SBC contribution. Due to this suggestion, the NIOC modified the SBC contribution as a straw man to Issue #0208 (***Attachment #21***).
81. Bob asked participants if there were any objections to accepting the proposed straw man to Issue #0208. There were no objections.

Agreements Reached:

11. Participants agreed to accept the proposed straw man to Issue #0208.
12. The NIOC agreed that Issue #0208 will remain in Active status.

NIOC #37, January 15-16, 2003

Agreement Reached:

It was agreed that Issue #0208 would remain in Active status.

NIOC #38, April 7-9, 2003

44. It was noted that the WNPO responded to correspondence from the OBF regarding JIP. The WNPO correspondence was projected for participants to review, which is located within the SBC Contribution.

Secretary's Note: The WNPO correspondence can also be found on the OBF Correspondence web page at http://www.atis.org/ATIS/CLC/OBF/obf_corr.htm.

Agreement Reached:

8. Participants agreed to continue discussing all of the aspects of JIP, as suggested by the SBC contribution, under Issue #0208 with the understanding that if after investigation is complete and it is determined that a separate issue is necessary, that a separate issue might be drafted.

Points Noted:

58. Robin Meier offered to host interim non face-to-face meetings to continue discussion on Issue #0208.
59. Bob asked participants if there was any objection to scheduling full NIOC meetings as necessary and holding interim technical meetings on Issue #0208. There was no objection.

Agreement Reached:

9. Participants agreed to hold informal technical meetings and schedule full NIOC meetings as necessary for Issue #0208.

Action Item:

10. Robin Meier will create a schedule of topics related to Issue #0208 for further discussion at NIOC #38.

Agreements Reached:

10. Participants agreed to revisit Issue #0208 at the end of NIOC #38.
11. It was agreed that Issue #0208 would remain in Active status.

Action Item:

15. Robin Meier will send an email to the NIIFALL exploder list with potential dates for conference calls related to Issue #0208.

Point Noted:

85. Bob asked if there was any objection to leaving Issue #0208 in active status. There was no objection.

Agreement Reached:

17. It was agreed that Issue #0208 would remain in Active status.

NIOC #39 – June 11-12, 2003

Action Item:

9. Veronica Lancaster will post the WNPO correspondence emailed from Robin Meier to the NIOC #38 meeting record.

Agreements Reached:

7. It was agreed that the Issue #0208 sub-team team would continue to meet via informal conference calls.
8. It was agreed that Issue #0208 would remain in Active status.

Action Items:

10. An Issue #0208 sub team conference call will be held on June 23, 2003 from 10:30 am – Noon Eastern, with the bridge being 800-215-4958 passcode of 5184575#.
11. Veronica Lancaster will post the Issue #0208 conference call information for the June 23, 2003 conference call on the NIIF conference call web site.
12. Veronica Lancaster will notify participants via the NIIF exploder that a conference call will be held on June 23, 2003.

NIOC #40, August 11-13, 2003

Agreement Reached:

10. Participants agreed to accept grammatical changes made to the Issue #0208 JIP Document presented by Penn Pfautz, AT&T.

Point Noted:

101. Stu objected to the inserted text in one sentence of the background section and requested that the original text be placed back into the document. Robin asked if there was any objection to reject the change to the background paragraph of the Issue #0208 JIP document presented by Penn Pfautz, AT&T. There was no objection.

Agreement Reached:

11. Participants agreed to reject the change to the background paragraph of the Issue #0208 JIP document presented by Penn Pfautz, AT&T.

Action Item:

21. Veronica Lancaster will draft proposed correspondence to the OBF, WNPO, T1P1, T1S1, TR.45, and CTIA regarding Issue #0208 for NIOC review.

Agreement Reached:

12. It was agreed that Issue #0208 would remain in Active status.

Points Noted:

196. Participants reviewed draft correspondence to the OBF, WNPO, T1P1, T1S1, TR 45, and CTIA from the NIIF requesting the review of an attached JIP document with draft text to be included in the NIIF Reference Document upon the closure of Issue #0208. Participants modified the draft correspondence for acceptance (**Attachment #44**).
197. Robin asked if there were any objections to accepting the correspondence as modified. There was no objection.

Agreements Reached:

22. Participants agreed to accept the draft correspondence as modified as NIIF Correspondence 0308XX-002.
23. It was agreed that Issue #0208 will remain in Active status.

Action Items:

34. Veronica Lancaster will add the approval of NIIF Correspondence 0308XX-002 to the NIIF #40 General Session agenda.
35. Robin will email the new WNPO chair information to Veronica Lancaster, for use in sending correspondence 0308XX-002.

General Session #40, August 14, 2003

Points Noted:

31. Participants reviewed Correspondence 0308XX-002.
32. Participants made minor revisions to incorporate the Issue statement of Issue #0208 and a minor grammatical change.
33. Dave asked for any objection to sending correspondence 0308XX-002 as modified. There was no objection.

Agreement Reached:

9. The NIIF General Session agreed to send correspondence 0308XX-002 as modified pending approval by ATIS Legal

Action Items:

8. Veronica Lancaster will forward Correspondence 0308XX-002 to ATIS Legal for review and approval.
9. Upon approval from ATIS Legal, Veronica Lancaster will send correspondence 0308XX-002 to recipients, post to the NIIF correspondence web page, and notify NIIF participants via the NIIF exploder list.

NIOC #41, October 22-23, 2003**Action Items:**

12. Stu Goldman will contact Cheryl Blum, TR.45, to request a response to NIIF Correspondence #030910-002 be sent to the NIIF Administrator.
13. Upon receipt of correspondence from TR.45, Veronica Lancaster will post the response on the NIIF Correspondence web page and notify the NIIF of the receipt and posting via the NIIF exploder.

Agreement Reached:

7. It was agreed that Issue #0208 would remain in Active status.

NIOC #42, January 13-15, 2004**Action Item:**

4. Veronica Lancaster will post the correspondence from Cheryl Blum TR 45.2 regarding NIIF Issue #0208, Jurisdiction Information Parameter (JIP) to the NIIF Correspondence Received web page as NIIF Correspondence #040114-001.

Action Item:

5. Veronica Lancaster will post the correspondence from the WNPO in response to NIIF Correspondence requesting review of NIIF draft text to the NIIF Correspondence Received web page as NIIF Correspondence #040114-002.

Agreement Reached:

8. Participants agreed to reconvene the Issue #0208 sub team.

Action Items:

6. A meeting of the Issue #0208 sub team is necessary. Based on a review of activities by other industry bodies, the NIIF rules for populating JIP need to be revisited by considering the population of JIP at the state/LATA level, MSC, or means consistent with other industry work.

7. A conference call for the Issue #0208 sub team meeting will be held on February 10, 2004, from 10:00 am – 12:00 pm Eastern. The bridge for the call is 312-814-9057 and the pin is 6628608#. Administrative support is not required for this call.
8. Robin Meier will send a notification to Issue #0208 sub team members announcing details for the February 10, 2004 Issue #0208 sub team conference call.
9. Veronica Lancaster will post the Issue #0208 sub team conference call information on the NIIF Conference Call Calendar web page and send corresponding exploder list messages.

Agreement Reached:

9. It was agreed that Issue #0208 would remain in Active status.

NIOC #43, March 22-24, 2004

Agreements Reached:

10. Participants agreed to accept the change to rule #4 as presented in the Lucent contribution to Issue #0208 and modified by the NIOC during NIOC #43.
11. Participants agreed to accept the Issue #0208 Proposed Text as revised by both the NIOC Issue #0208 sub team and during discussion at NIOC #43 as the final draft of text.

Action Item:

10. Veronica Lancaster will draft follow up correspondence to the original addressees of correspondence #030910-002 to include the agreed upon text accepted during NIOC #43 as the final draft text of Issue #0208.

Agreement Reached:

12. Participants agreed to draft correspondence to T1S1 based on presented text in the second Lucent contribution to Issue #0208.

Action Item:

11. Veronica Lancaster will draft correspondence to T1S1 based on presented text in the second Lucent contribution to Issue #0208.

Agreements Reached:

13. It was agreed that correspondence would be reviewed prior to the end of NIOC #43.
14. It was agreed that Issue #0208 would remain in Active status.

NIOC #44, June 15-17, 2004

Agreement Reached:

22. Participants agreed to send NIIF Correspondence #0406XX-005 to TR45.2

Agreement Reached:

23. NIOC participants agreed to hold a full NIOC conference call on Issue #0208, Jurisdiction Information Parameter (JIP), on July 27, 2004 from 11:00 am to 2:00 pm Eastern.

Action Item:

30. A conference call is necessary. A full NIOC conference call on Issue #0208, Jurisdiction Information Parameter (JIP), will be held on July 27, 2004 from 11:00 am to 2:00 pm Eastern. SBC volunteered to provide the conference bridge for 30 ports. Administrative support is requested. Placeware is requested for 30 ports.

Agreement Reached:

24. Participants agreed to send NIIF Correspondence #0406XX-005mod to all original recipients of NIIF Correspondence #040428-001.

Action Items:

31. Veronica Lancaster will place NIIF Correspondence #0406XX-005mod on NIIF letterhead.
32. Upon legal approval, Veronica Lancaster will send NIIF Correspondence #0406XX-005mod as soon as possible.
33. Veronica Lancaster will schedule Placeware for 30 ports on July 27, 2004 from 11:00 am – 2:00 pm Eastern.

Agreement Reached:

25. Participants agreed to send NIIF Correspondence #0406XX-006 to TR45.2.

Action Items:

34. Veronica Lancaster will place NIIF Correspondence #0406XX-006 to TR45.2 on NIIF letterhead.
35. Upon legal approval, Veronica Lancaster will send NIIF Correspondence #0406XX-005mod as soon as possible.

Agreement Reached:

26. It was agreed that Issue #0208, Jurisdiction Information Parameter (JIP), would remain in Active status.

NIOC Conference Call – July 27, 2004

Action Items:

1. Participants will review the following modified Rule 4 to provide feedback for a future conference call following planned committee meetings:

Where technically feasible if the originating wireline/wireless switch serves multiple states/LATAs, then the switch should support multiple JIPs such that the JIP used for a given call can be populated with an NPA-NXX that is specific to both the switch as well as the state and LATA of the caller.

If the JIP cannot be populated at the state and LATA level and it is technically feasible, then the JIP should be populated with an NPA-NXX specific to the originating switch.

2. Veronica Lancaster will send a copy of the draft notes from today's conference call to call participants so that participants can review the proposed language changes to Rule 4 in future committee meetings.
3. A conference call is necessary. A conference call will be held on September 29, 2004 from 11:00 am – 2:00 pm Eastern. SBC will provide the bridge and Placeware is requested for 30 ports. Administrative support is requested.

Action Item:

4. Cathie Capita will contact the NRRIC Co Chairs regarding a possible meeting in August or September regarding the proposed changes for Rule 4 of the Seven Rules of JIP.

NIOC #45, August 9-11, 2004

Agreement Reached:

27. It was agreed that Issue #0208, Jurisdiction Information Parameter (JIP), would remain in Active status.

NIOC Conference Call – September 29, 2004

Agreement Reached:

1. Participants agreed to modify Rule 4 as follows:

Where technically feasible if the originating switch or MSC serves multiple states/LATAs, then the switch should support multiple JIPs such that the JIP used for a given call can be populated with an NPA-NXX that is specific to both the switch as well as the state and LATA of the caller.

If the JIP cannot be populated at the state and LATA level, the JIP should be populated with an NPA-NXX specific to the originating switch or MSC where it is technically feasible.

Action Item:

1. Participants will review the remainder of the rules for JIP for possible language changes to specify originating switch or MSC where applicable.

Agreement Reached:

2. Participants agreed to replace the current Rule #4 in the Issue #0208 draft text document with the following Rule #4:

Where technically feasible if the originating switch or MSC serves multiple states/LATAs, then the switch should support multiple JIPs such that the JIP used for a given call can be populated with an NPA-NXX that is specific to both the switch as well as the state and LATA of the caller.

If the JIP cannot be populated at the state and LATA level, the JIP should be populated with an NPA-NXX specific to the originating switch or MSC where it is technically feasible.

Agreement Reached:

3. Participants agreed to replace the current Rule 7 with the following Rule 7 in the Issue #0208 draft text document:

As per T1.TRQ2, the JIP should be reset when a new billable call leg is created.

Agreement Reached:

4. Participants agreed to accept the 7 rules of JIP as modified during the September 29, 2004 Issue #0208, Jurisdiction Information Parameter (JIP), conference call.

Agreement Reached:

5. Participants agreed to create a separate document for the 7 Rules for Populating JIP (***Attachment #6***).

NIOC #46 – October 13-15, 2004

Agreement Reached:

53. Participants agreed to request that the ATIS Public Relations Department issue a press release on the development of the 7 Rules for Populating JIP, which was created in cooperation with wireline and wireless industry groups.

Agreement Reached:

28. It was agreed that Issue #0208, Jurisdiction Information Parameter (JIP), would be placed in Initial Closure status with the following resolution statement.

RESOLUTION: In cooperation with wireline and wireless industry groups, the NIOC has developed the following 7 Rules for populating JIP. The NIIF has agreed that the 7 Rules for Populating JIP would be added to the NIIF Reference Document, Part III, SS7, after Section 8 to become a new Section 9 called Rules for Populating JIP.

Rules for Populating JIP

- 1. JIP should be populated in the IAMs of all wireline and wireless originating calls where technically feasible.*
- 2. JIP should be populated with an NPA-NXX that is assigned in the LERG to the originating switch or MSC.*
- 3. The NIIF does not recommend proposing that the JIP parameter be mandatory since calls missing any mandatory parameter will be aborted. However, the NIIF strongly recommends that the JIP be populated on all calls where technologically possible.*
- 4. Where technically feasible if the originating switch or MSC serves multiple states/LATAs, then the switch should support multiple JIPs such that the JIP used for a given call can be populated with an NPA-NXX that is specific to both the switch as well as the state and LATA of the caller.*

If the JIP cannot be populated at the state and LATA level, the JIP should be populated with an NPA-NXX specific to the originating switch or MSC where it is technically feasible.
- 5. Where the originating switch cannot signal JIP it is desirable that the subsequent switch in the call path populate the JIP using a data fill default associated with the incoming route. The value of the data fill item is an NPA-NXX associated with the originating switch or MSC and reflects its location.*
- 6. When call forwarding occurs, the forwarded from DN (Directory Number) field will be populated, the JIP will be changed to a JIP associated with the forwarded from DN and the new called DN will be inserted in the IAM.*
- 7. As per T1.TRQ2, the JIP should be reset when a new billable call leg is created.*

Action Item:

29. ATIS will request through the ATIS Public Relations Department that a press release be issued on the development of the 7 Rules for Populating JIP, which was created in cooperation with wireline and wireless industry groups, upon the final closure of Issue #0208, Jurisdiction Information Parameter

Agreement Reached:

11. Participants agreed to request that the ATIS Public Relations Department issue a press release on the development of the 7 Rules for Populating JIP, which was created in cooperation with wireline and wireless industry groups.
12. It was agreed that Issue #0208, Jurisdiction Information Parameter (JIP), would be placed in Initial Closure status with the following resolution statement.

RESOLUTION: In cooperation with wireline and wireless industry groups, the NIOC has developed the following 7 Rules for populating JIP. The NIIF has agreed that the 7 Rules for Populating JIP would be added to the NIIF Reference Document, Part III, SS7, after Section 8 to become a new Section 9 called Rules for Populating JIP.

Rules for Populating JIP

1. *JIP should be populated in the IAMs of all wireline and wireless originating calls where technically feasible.*
2. *JIP should be populated with an NPA-NXX that is assigned in the LERG to the originating switch or MSC.*
3. *The NIIF does not recommend proposing that the JIP parameter be mandatory since calls missing any mandatory parameter will be aborted. However, the NIIF strongly recommends that the JIP be populated on all calls where technologically possible.*
4. *Where technically feasible if the originating switch or MSC serves multiple states/LATAs, then the switch should support multiple JIPs such that the JIP used for a given call can be populated with an NPA-NXX that is specific to both the switch as well as the state and LATA of the caller.*

If the JIP cannot be populated at the state and LATA level, the JIP should be populated with an NPA-NXX specific to the originating switch or MSC where it is technically feasible.
5. *Where the originating switch cannot signal JIP it is desirable that the subsequent switch in the call path populate the JIP using a data fill default associated with the incoming route. The value of the data fill item is an NPA-NXX associated with the originating switch or MSC and reflects its location.*
6. *When call forwarding occurs, the forwarded from DN (Directory Number) field will be populated, the JIP will be changed to a JIP associated with the forwarded from DN and the new called DN will be inserted in the IAM.*

7. *As per T1.TRQ2, the JIP should be reset when a new billable call leg is created.*

Action Item:

5. ATIS will request through the ATIS Public Relations Department that a press release be issued on the development of the 7 Rules for Populating JIP, which was created in cooperation with wireline and wireless industry groups, upon the final closure of Issue #0208, Jurisdiction Information Parameter

RESOLUTION: *In cooperation with wireline and wireless industry groups, the NIOC has developed the following 7 Rules for populating JIP. The NIIF has agreed that the 7 Rules for Populating JIP would be added to the NIIF Reference Document, Part III, SS7, after Section 8 to become a new Section 9 called Rules for Populating JIP.*

Rules for Populating JIP

1. *JIP should be populated in the IAMs of all wireline and wireless originating calls where technically feasible.*
2. *JIP should be populated with an NPA-NXX that is assigned in the LERG to the originating switch or MSC.*
3. *The NIIF does not recommend proposing that the JIP parameter be mandatory since calls missing any mandatory parameter will be aborted. However, the NIIF strongly recommends that the JIP be populated on all calls where technologically possible.*
4. *Where technically feasible if the originating switch or MSC serves multiple states/LATAs, then the switch should support multiple JIPs such that the JIP used for a given call can be populated with an NPA-NXX that is specific to both the switch as well as the state and LATA of the caller.*

If the JIP cannot be populated at the state and LATA level, the JIP should be populated with an NPA-NXX specific to the originating switch or MSC where it is technically feasible.

5. *Where the originating switch cannot signal JIP it is desirable that the subsequent switch in the call path populate the JIP using a data fill default associated with the incoming route. The value of the data fill item is an NPA-NXX associated with the originating switch or MSC and reflects its location.*
6. *When call forwarding occurs, the forwarded from DN (Directory Number) field will be populated, the JIP will be changed to a JIP associated with the forwarded from DN and the new called DN will be inserted in the IAM.*
7. *As per T1.TRQ2, the JIP should be reset when a new billable call leg is created.*

DOCUMENTATION REQUIREMENT:
(optional)